

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/299,724	04/27/1999	JONATHAN KAGLE	. 03797.78520	3637
28319 7:	590 02/10/2004	•	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
1001 G STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ELEVENTH STREET			2178	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
<del></del>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/299,724	KAGLE, JONATHAN				
	Examiner Cong Los Humb	Art Unit				
The MAII INC DATE of this communication on	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		·				
THE REPLY FILED 30 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applicand a timely filed amendment which all (with appeal fee); or (3) a timeless.	ation. A proper reply to a the places the application in				
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Oftimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	d of extension and the corresponding amo of the shortened statutory period for reply ffice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	because:					
. (a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the				
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without cance</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
.☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-64</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b)☐ disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	$\Lambda$ _ $\cdot$ $\Lambda$				
10. Other:	(	STEPHEN S. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER				





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Jois and Moore do not disclose "receiving a predetermined region selection signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing at a selected predetermined region on the display." Applicants address that the statement "selecting a predetermined region where each region has a different style selected for generating a web page inherently shows that the system has the selection signals for the selection actions when selecting the subtemplates of different styles" in the Action is an allegation.

## Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Jois does disclose selecting a subtemplate included in the master template for generating the web page layout (col 6, lines 14-34) where each subtemplate for each region of the web page has different styles of data implemented in HTML tags (col 7, lines 6-25). Accordingly, whenever a user selects a subtemplate of a style using a mouse or any selection device, it is true that the system must receive a selection signal from the selection action where the selected subtemplate is a selected predetermined region on the display. Jois, therefore, does suggest the argued feature. And the Action's reason for modifying Jois to incorporate the argued feature, therefore, is not an allegation.